

DECISION RECORD

Decision: It is my decision to authorize the issuance of a ten year term grazing permit of public lands on the Mill Iron Ranch, Allotment #64042, for 310 cows year long at 40 percent public land. Any additional mitigation measures identified in the environmental impacts sections of the attached environmental assessment have been formulated into stipulations, terms and conditions. Any comments made to this proposed treatment were considered and any necessary changes have been incorporated into the environmental assessment.

In accordance with 43 CFR 4160.2, any applicant, permittee, lessee, or other affected interests may protest this proposed decision in person or in writing to the authorized officer within 15 days after receipt of this decision. Please be specific in your points of protest. In the absence of a protest, this decision will become final without further notice.

Written appeal may be filed to the Final Decision for the purpose of a hearing before an administrative law judge under 43 CFR 4.470. A period of 30 days after receipt of the Final Decision is provided in which to file an appeal in this office. (43 CFR 4160.3 (c))

Signed by T. R. Kreager
Assistant Field Manager

6/26/01
Date

Environmental Assessment for Grazing Authorization
Allotment #64042
EA# NM-060-99-153

Roswell Field Office
Bureau of Land Management
2909 West 2nd
Roswell, NM 88201

T5S R23E, T5S R24E, T6S R24E, T4S R23E, various sections

I. Introduction

When authorizing livestock grazing on public range, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has historically relied on a land use plan and environmental impact statement to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A recent decision by the Interior Board of Land Appeals, however, affirmed that the BLM must conduct a site-specific NEPA analysis before issuing a permit or lease to authorize livestock grazing. This environmental assessment fulfills the NEPA requirement by providing the necessary site-specific analysis of the effects of issuing a new grazing permit on allotment #64042.

A. Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of issuing a new grazing permit would be to authorize livestock grazing on public range on this allotment. The permit would specify the types and levels of use authorized, and the terms and conditions of the authorization pursuant to 43 CFR §§4130.3, 4130.3-1, and 4130.3-2.

B. Conformance with Land Use Planning

The Roswell Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (October 1997) has been reviewed to determine if the proposed action conforms with the land use plan's Record of Decision as required by 43 CFR 1610.5-3. The proposed action is consistent with the RMP/EIS.

C. Relationships to Statutes, Regulations, or Other Plans

The proposed action and alternative is consistent with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1700 et seq.); the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.), as amended; the Clean Water Act (CWA)(33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), as amended; the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1535 et seq.) as amended; the

Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.); Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management and Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands.

II. Proposed Action and Alternatives

A. Proposed Action (BLM preferred):

The proposed action is to authorize to Mill Iron Inc. a grazing permit on allotment # 64042 for 310 Animal Units (AU's) at 40% federal range. This equates to 1488 Animal Unit Months (AUM's). Grazing will be authorized from March 1 thru the last day of February of each year. The class of livestock is cattle and horses. There are no projects planned on federal land for this allotment at this time. Any subsequent management activities will have a site specific analysis conducted at that time.

B. No Permit authorization alternative:

This alternative would be not to issue a new grazing permit. There would be no livestock grazing authorized on public land. The No Grazing alternative was considered, but not chosen in the Rangeland Reform Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Record of Decision (ROD) (p. 28). The elimination of grazing in the Roswell Field Office Area was considered but eliminated by the Roswell RMP/ROD (pp. ROD-2).

C. Increase Alternative

This alternative would be to increase the grazing permit on allotment #64042 to 400 AU's at 40% federal range. This alternative would have a significant negative impact to the vegetative and soil resources on the allotment. Vegetative monitoring studies on this allotment do not support this number, therefore there will be no further consideration of this alternative.

III. Affected Environment

A. General Setting

Allotment #64042 is located in Chaves county, about 26 miles north of Roswell. The allotment consists of 6 pastures and 1 trap. This allotment contains 16,182 acres of which 6,780 acres are Federal land.

This allotment is located within the Grassland vegetative community as identified within the Roswell RMP. The distinguishing feature for the grassland community is that grass species typically comprises 75% or more of the potential plant community. Short-grass, mid-grass, and tall-grass species may be found within this community. The community also includes shrub, half-shrub, and forb species. The percentages of grasses, forbs, and shrubs actually found at a particular location will vary with recent weather factors and past resource uses.

The following resources or values are not present or would not be affected: Prime/Unique Farmland, ACEC's, Minority/Low Income Populations, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wetlands/Riparian, Hazardous/Solid Wastes, Invasive Non-Native Species, Native American Religious Concerns. Cultural inventory surveys would continue to be required for federal actions involving surface disturbing activities. The impact of the proposed action and alternatives to minority or low-income populations or communities has been considered and no significant impact is anticipated.

B. Affected Resources

1. Soils: The soils present within this allotment belong to the Hollomex-Reeves-Milner general mapping unit. These soils are deep, well drained, nearly level to undulating soils on terraces. For more information, refer to Soil Survey of Chaves County New Mexico, Northern Part. There is a certain amount of erosion that occurs naturally in this vegetation community. High winds in the spring and high intensity thunderstorms are the primary agents of soil transportation.

2. Vegetation: This allotment is within the grassland vegetative community as identified in the Roswell Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS). Vegetative communities managed by the Roswell Field Office are identified and explained in the RMP/EIS. Appendix 11 of the draft RMP/EIS describes the Desired Plant Community (DPC) concept and identifies the components of each community.

The dominant ecological (range) site on the allotment is Loamy SD-3. Range site descriptions are available for review at the Roswell BLM office or any Natural Resources Conservation Service office. There are 3 vegetative monitoring studies on this allotment. Monitoring evaluations have been completed in 1983, 1988 and 1993. Analysis of the monitoring data indicates condition is good and range trend is upward. There is sufficient forage to meet multiple use requirements and for the number of AUs which have been permitted in the past. The percent bare ground and rock found on the allotment fall within the parameters established by the RMP/EIS for this vegetative community. Copies of the monitoring data and the analysis of the data are available at the Roswell Field Office.

The following table summarizes monitoring data for the allotment:

Monitoring Data Summary, Allotment Averages							
	Grasses	Forbs	Shrubs	Trees	Litter	Bare Ground	Rocks
Percent composition of vegetative cover	91.96	0.00	8.11	0.04	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percent Ground Cover	32.38		3.04		27.13	37.21	0.00

3. Wildlife: Game species occurring within the area include mule deer, antelope, mourning dove, and scaled quail. Raptors that utilize the area on a more seasonal basis include the swainson's, red-tailed, and ferruginous hawks, American kestrel, and great-horned owl. Numerous passerine birds utilize the grassland areas due to the variety of grasses, forbs, and shrubs. The most common include the western meadowlark, mockingbird, horned lark, killdeer, loggerhead shrike, and vesper sparrow.

The warm prairie environment supports a large number of reptile species compared to higher elevations. The more common reptiles include the short-horned lizard, lesser earless lizard, eastern fence lizard, coachwhip, bullsnake, prairie rattlesnake, and western rattlesnake.

A general description of wildlife occupying or potentially utilizing the proposed action area and associated Habitat Management Areas refer to the Affected Environment Section (p. 3-62 to 3-71) of the Draft Roswell RMP/EIS (9/1984).

4. Threatened and Endangered Species: There are no known threatened or endangered species of plant or animals on this allotment. A list of federal threatened, endangered and candidate species reviewed for this EA can be found in Appendix 11 of the Roswell Approved RMP (AP11-2). There are no designated critical habitat areas within this allotment. The swift fox is a Federal Candidate species that may occupy or utilize the area; refer to the Biological Opinion (AP11-38) in the Roswell RMP for a detailed description of the range, habitats and potential threats. The mountain plover has been recently proposed for listing as an Endangered Species. It is associated with shortgrass and shrub-steep landscapes throughout its breeding and wintering range. Historically, on the breeding range, it occurred on nearly denuded prairie dog towns and in areas of major bison concentration. The mountain plover are considered to be strongly associated with sites of heaviest grazing pressure, to

the point of excessive surface disturbance. Short vegetation, bare ground, and a flat topography are now recognized as habitat-defining characteristics at both breeding and wintering locales

5. Livestock Management: The allotment is grazed by cattle. There are 6 pastures and 1 trap. The latest grazing permit was for 310 AU's active use. A deferred rotation grazing system is used. Two pastures usually get deferment during the growing season. Actual livestock numbers on the allotment may be less than the active use depending on vegetative and economic conditions.

6. Visual Resources: The allotment is located within a Class IV Visual Resource Management area. This means that contrasts may attract attention and be a dominant feature in the landscape in terms of scale. However, the changes should repeat the basic elements of the landscape.

7. Water Quality: There are no springs or windmills located on federal land on this allotment.

8. Air Quality: Air quality in the region is generally good. The allotment is in a Class II area for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration of air quality as defined in the federal Clean Air Act. Class II areas allow a moderate amount of air quality degradation.

9. Recreation: Since this allotment has no facility based recreational activities, only dispersed recreational opportunities occur on these lands. Recreational activities that occur include hunting, caving, sightseeing, Off Highway Vehicle Use, primitive camping, horseback riding and hiking.

Legal and physical access to public lands located in this allotment are through state lands and county maintained roads. Off Highway Vehicle designation for public lands within this allotment are classified as "Limited" to existing roads and trails. The majority of public lands in this allotment can only be accessed by foot (hiking, or walking).

10. Cave/Karst: There are no known significant caves on this allotment. This area has a high potential for cave/karst features. There will be no further discussion of this resource.

11. Floodplain: Huggins Draw is an ephemeral drainage that crosses approximately 2 1/2 mile of private land as it flows through the allotment. (Federal Emergency Management Agency. 1978. Flood insurance rate map. Chaves County, New Mexico).

IV. Environmental Impacts

A. Impacts of the Proposed Action

1. Soils: Livestock remove the cover of standing vegetation and litter, and compact the soil by trampling. These effects can lead to reduced infiltration rates and increased runoff. Reduced vegetative cover and increased runoff can result in higher erosion rates and soil losses, making it more difficult to produce forage and to protect the soil from further erosion. These adverse effects can be greatly reduced by maintaining an adequate vegetative cover on the soil. Ongoing vegetation studies conducted on the allotment indicate that, at the level of grazing identified in the proposed action, the percent bare ground and rock found on the allotment fall within the parameters established by the RMP/EIS for this vegetative community. Proper utilization levels and grazing distribution patterns are expected to retain sufficient vegetative cover on the allotment as a whole and this will maintain the stability of the soils. Soil compaction and excessive vegetative use will occur at small, localized areas such as drinking locations, along trails and at bedding areas. Positive affects from the proposed action include the speeding up of the nutrient cycling process and chipping of the soil crust by hoof action.

2. Vegetation: Vegetation will continue to be grazed and trampled by domestic livestock as well as other herbivores. The area has been grazed by livestock since the early part of the 1900's, if not longer. Ecological condition and trend is expected to remain stable and/or improve over the long term at the permitted number of livestock. Vegetation monitoring indicates that there is an adequate amount of forage for the proposed number of livestock and for wildlife.

3. Wildlife: Domestic livestock will continue to utilize vegetative resources needed by a variety of wildlife species for life history functions within this allotment. The magnitude of livestock grazing impacts on wildlife is dependent upon the species of wildlife being considered, and it's habitat needs. In general, livestock stocking rate adjustments have been made in the past to minimize the direct competition for those vegetative resources needed by a variety of wildlife species. Cover habitat for wildlife will remain the same as the existing situation. Maintenance and operation of existing waterings will continue to provide dependable water sources for wildlife, as well as livestock.

4. Threatened and Endangered Species: Surveys have been conducted in New Mexico for the mountain plover by Lawry Sager in 1995, for the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (Sager, 1996). No breeding populations were found south of the 34° North Latitude which generally follows the Chaves/DeBaca County line on the north end of the Roswell Field Office area. However, no birds were reported in either DeBaca or Chaves Countys; only one observation was reported in Lincoln County (near Lon). In addition, mountain plover surveys were conducted in 1998 at BLM selected sites by New Mexico

Natural Heritage Program (DeLay & Johnson, 1998). No mountain plovers were observed at the sites. As mountain plovers prefer short vegetation and actually seek out grazed pastures, the cumulative impacts from grazing are not anticipated to adversely affect the bird. Grazing practices which maintain or improve ground cover to the greatest extent possible could decrease mountain plover habitat. The preferred alternative will continue to emphasize proper watershed management, but is unlikely to adversely affect this species or its habitat in the mixed desert shrub area. Since no known wintering locales or breeding sites have been found and no known prairie dog towns are located within this allotment, proper grazing management is not likely to jeopardize, destroy or adversely modify the habitat.

5. Livestock Management: Livestock would continue to be grazed under the same management system and the same numbers in accordance with the livestock use agreements signed in 1995. Actual livestock numbers may be less than the active use depending on vegetative and economic conditions. No adverse impacts are anticipated.

6. Visual Resources: The continued grazing of livestock would not affect the form or color of the landscape, or the primary aspect of the vegetation within the allotment.

7. Water Quality: The drainages on the allotment are ephemeral, so direct impacts to surface water quality would be minor, short-term impacts during stormflow. Indirect impacts to water-quality related resources, such as fisheries, would not occur. The proposed action would not have a significant effect on ground water. Livestock would be dispersed over the allotment, and the soil would filter potential contaminants.

8. Air Quality: Dust levels under the proposed action would be slightly higher than under the no grazing alternative due to allotment management activities. The levels would still be within the limits allowed in a Class II area for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration of air quality.

9. Recreation: Grazing should have little or no impact on the dispersed recreational opportunities within this allotment, since the recreational use of these public lands are relatively low. The evidence or presence of livestock can negatively affect visitors who desire solitude, unspoiled landscape views or hike without seeing signs of livestock. However, grazing can benefit some forms or recreation, such as hunting, by creating new water sources for game animals.

10. Floodplain: Continued livestock grazing and allotment management activities would have negligible effect on floodplain function as long as additional development in the floodplain is avoided where practical.

B. Impacts of the No Livestock Grazing Alternative.

1. Soils: Soil compaction would be reduced on the allotment around old trails and drinking troughs and there would be a small reduction in soil loss on the allotment.

2. Vegetation: It is expected that the number of plant species found within the allotment will remain the same, however, there would be small changes in the relative percentages of these species. Vegetation will continue to be utilized by wildlife. There would be an increase in the amount of standing vegetation.

3. Wildlife: Wildlife would have no competition with livestock for forage and cover. There would be no maintenance of livestock waters. As these waters became inoperable, water availability could become a critical limiting factor for many wildlife species.

4. There would be no change in the mountain plover habitat if the no grazing alternative was selected.

5. Livestock management: The forage from public land would be unavailable for use by the permittee. This would have a significant adverse economic impact to the livestock operation. The checkerboard land status on the allotment makes it economically unfeasible to fence out the federal land and use only the private land. It would become uneconomical for the permittee to continue agricultural production.

6. Visual Resources: There would be no change in the visual resources.

7. Water Quality: There could be a slight improvement in water quality due to the minor reductions in sediment loading during stormflow.

8. Air Quality: There would be a slightly less dust under this alternative versus the proposed alternative, but this would be negligible when considering all sources of dust.

9. Recreation: Those recreationists who desire solitude and no livestock would be benefitted from this alternative. Hunters may not benefit from this alternative if livestock waters are not maintained, which would affect hunting opportunities.

10. Floodplain: Changes in floodplain function would be negligible if livestock grazing was eliminated.

V. Cumulative Impacts

All of the allotments that have permits/leases with the BLM will have to go through scoping and analysis under NEPA. This allotment is near allotments that will be undergoing this process. If the proposed action is selected, there would be no change in the cumulative impacts since it does not vary from the current situation.

If the no livestock grazing alternative is selected, there would be little change in the cumulative impact as long as the surrounding allotments continue to be stocked at their current level. If the permitted/leased numbers are reduced on the surrounding ranches as well, the economics of the surrounding communities and/or minority/low income populations would be negatively impacted.

The No Grazing alternative was considered, but not chosen in the Rangeland Reform Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Record of Decision (ROD) (p. 28). The elimination of grazing in the Roswell Field Office Area was also considered but eliminated by the Roswell RMP/ROD (pp. ROD-2).

VI. Residual Impacts

The area has been grazed by livestock since the early part of the 1900's, if not longer. Vegetative monitoring studies have shown that grazing, at the current permitted numbers of animals, is sustainable. If the mitigation measures are enacted, then there would be no residual impacts to the proposed action.

VII. Mitigating Measures

Vegetation monitoring studies will continue to be conducted and the permitted numbers of livestock will be adjusted if necessary. If new information surfaces that livestock grazing is negatively impacting other resources, action will be taken at that time to mitigate those impacts.

VIII. Fundamentals of Rangeland Health

The fundamentals of rangeland health are identified in 43 CFR §§4180.1 and pertain to watershed function, ecological processes, water quality, and habitat for threatened and endangered (T&E) species and other special status species. Based on the available data and professional judgement, the evaluation by this environmental assessment indicates that the conditions identified in the fundamentals of rangeland health exist on the allotment.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/RATIONALE

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT: I have reviewed this environmental assessment including the explanation and resolution of any potentially significant environmental impacts. I have determined the **proposed action** will not have significant impacts on the human environment and that preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

Rationale for Recommendations: The proposed action would not result in any undue or unnecessary environmental degradation. The **proposed action** will be in compliance with the Roswell Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (October, 1997).

T. R. Kreager,
Acting Assistant Field Office Manager - Resources

Date